

COLLEGE OF PHARMACY SEED GRANT REVIEW SHEET

Applicant Name	
Project Title	
PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
Briefly describe the project in about one paragraph, including the objectives and the research design and methods.	
CRITIQUE	SCORING AND COMMENTS
Significance: Does this study address an important problem? Will successful completion of the project lead to an advance in the field, set the stage for submission of a proposal to an extramural funding agency, or otherwise provide a significant return on the investment made?	Score:
Innovation: Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions proposed?	Score:
Approach: Does this proposal contain clear and feasible specific aims and, if applicable, appropriate hypotheses that would be tested by the specific aims. Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented?	Score:

Qualifications of the PI: Are the PI and the research team qualified to perform the proposed work? Is the proposed work appropriate to the experience level of the PI? Have the investigators exhibited a track record of productivity using previous resources afforded them?	Score:
Facilities and resources available: Is the environment in which the work will be done conducive to success? Are all the resources necessary for successful completion of the project available to the PI?	Score:

College of Pharmacy Seed Grant Scoring System:

Assigned reviewers will be instructed to provide a separate score on a 9-point rating scale for each of the **five review criteria indicated above**. Reviewers will then provide an **overall impact/priority score** for each application according to the following descriptions and additional guidance: The overall impact score need not be an average of the five review criteria, but will take into consideration that an application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact.

Impact	Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses
High	1	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
	2	Outstanding	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
	3	Excellent	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
Medium	4	Very Good	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
	5	Good	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
	6	Satisfactory	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
Low	7	Fair	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
	8	Marginal	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
	9	Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses
Non-numeric score options: NR = Not Recommended for Further Consideration,			
Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact			
Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens impact			
Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits impact			

This scoring is consistent with the current NIH scoring system. Scores are then multiplied by ten, for a range from 10 through 90; therefore a low score will indicate a higher probability of funding.

Primary Reviewer Overall IMPACT Score	
Secondary Reviewer Overall IMPACT Score	
Committee Member Overall IMPACT Score	